The unlimited PREROGATIVE OF KINGS subverted.

Or a Short *Treatise* grounded upon *Scripture* and *Reason*, to prove that *Kings* ought as well as others to bee accountable for their Actions.

MATTHEW 22. 21.

Render unto Cæsar *the things that are* Cæsars, *and unto God the things that are Gods.*

By a well wisher to the Church of God, His King and *Countrey*.

And dedicated to all such as love the Truth.

THere will be times (saith the Apostle) *wherein men will not indure sound doctrine*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 3. *but will give heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. And certainly, if ever these times shall come to be fullfilled, now they are, when as Court Parasites and ambitious flatterers, Divines as well as others whose chiefest Policy now it is to *have mens persons in admiration for advantage sake*, *Iude* 16. and to please those by whom they may be dignified or rewarded; care not what falsities they speak, nor what untruths they doe maintain; and which is worst of all, are not asham'd to father their lies even upon the very Scriptures of truth themselvs, *wresting the same* (as S. *Peter* saith, 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. through their willingly wilfull Ignorance) *to their own destruction*. Among which this is none of the least, which they say, *That Kings are not responsall to any, save God for their actions*: And for this they bring the saying of the Preacher, *Eccles.* 8. 4 where he saith thus, *Where the word of a King is, there is power, and who may say unto him what doest thou?* Which words if they be throughly scan'd and examined, you shall find they yeeld no such construction; but rather the contrary: For in the 2*d* verse before going, the Wise man gives us this charge, *to keep the Kings Commandement*. I suppose if they understand themselvs, they will not say that by vertue therof we are bound to do whatsoever the King injoynes us, whether it be right or wrong: but that it hath respect to those things that are either agreeable, or at least not contrary to the Commandement of God; and the reason therof is given in the words following, in regard of the Oath of God. Now there are none (I think) will say (if Kings come lawfully in with the choice and consent of their People, as all lawfull Kings doe) that his Oath hath only respect unto the People, as if it did bind only on their part; but also on the part of the King, who Sweares to rule and govern them according to the Laws of God, and of

the Land; and upon this condition they Sweare Obedience unto him. This we may see sufficiently proved by the Covenant of *David* made with his people, 1 *Chron.* 11.1. where it is said, *All the Elders of Israel came to the King to Hebron, and* David *made a Covenant with them in Hebron before the Lord:* and then it followes, *they anointed him King over Israel.* And then again wee see this proved by the mutuall Oath between *Ioash* and his people, 2 *Chron.*23.11. where it is said, *they brought out the Kings Son, and put upon him the Crown, and gave him the Testimonie* (that is to say) they made him enter into this Covenant to keep the Law of God, and to Govern them according thereunto: and then it followes, *they made him King, and Iehojada and his Sons anointed him, and said, God save the King.* And so again in the 16.v. of the same chapter. By this you see here was an Oath aswell on the Kings part as on the peoples; and thus the people are bound to keep the Kings commandement, when he walks according to this rule. And such is the Oath of the Kings of *England* when they come to their Crowns and Kingdomes.

Then he saith further in the 3d verse, *Be not hastie to goe out of his sight, stand not in an evill thing, for he doth whatsoever he pleaseth.* I hope there are none that dare be so Sacrilegiously bold, as from these words to attribute unto Kings an Almighty power, as the words seem to import, which is an Attribute only proper unto God to be Almighty, as the Psalmist shews. *Psal.* 115. 3. *Our God is in the heavens, he hath done whatsoever he pleased:* And *Psal.* 135.6 *Whatsoever the Lord pleased that did he in heaven and in earth,* &c. This were in an high measure to rob God of his glory, and to give that to the creature that is only due to the Creatour. Yet I know no reason why they may not say from these words (*The King doth whatsoever he pleaseth*) that Kings have an Almighty power; as well as to say from the other words (*who may say unto him what dost thou?*) that therfore Kings are accountable to none save God for their actions. For you see how the words follow one another, and what may be said of Kings in one respect, may be said of them in the other. But we may (if we will at least) take notice, that these words are brought in as having relation to *good* or *evill*; and that this is a phrase applyed unto Kings only to shew that their Power is great, and of a large extent, *For the good of those that doe well, and for the punishment of those that doe evill*; and that in respect thereof, we should have an awfull and reverentiall regard of them; for so the words run, *Stand not in an evill thing, for he doth whatsoever he pleaseth.*

Then for the words following, which are quoted by those that stand for the unlimited Prerogative, they have respect also to the same. And so it is most true, *That where the word of a King is there is power:* I, speaking as a King should, performing the Office of a King; having respect to his Oath and Covenant between God and his people, in commanding those things that are *good*, and punishing those things that are *evill*, then indeed *who may say unto him what dost thou?* no man may call him to Question: for asmuch as God the King of Kings hath put this power into his hands. And what is that indeed that makes Kings many times so slighted, and so little feared of their people but this, that they take no care at all to govern them according to their Laws? and what is it on the other side that addes majestie and magnificence unto them, but this, that they make the Laws of God and of the Land the rules of Magistracie and government? Herein consists the power of Kings which the Wise man here so much speaks of. But now that this place is not so to be understood, as the Royalists of our times for their own ends would have it, *that Kings are not accountable unto men for their actions*, may easilie appeare, by comparing this place with that in *Dan.* 4.35. where *Nebucadnezzar* after that he was restored again to his sences, and to his Kingdom, makes this acknowledgement

ledgement concerning the power of God (*Who may say unto him what dost thou?*) Implying thus much, that howsoever Kings may be great, and their power may reach very farre, as he for his own part was none of the meanest, being the greatest Monarch that was then in the world yet this did not belong unto him nor unto any King else whatsoever but was Gods sole Prerogative only to be responsall unto none for his actions.

By this you see how weak this place is for their purpose, who from hence would prove Kings *unlimited power*, as unaccountable to any save God: whereas all that the Wise man aimes at, is nothing but this, to shew the extent of the power of Kings for their peoples good, as by their Oaths they are tyed by all lawfull wayes to advance it; and withall to signifie unto us, what an awfull regard we ought to have of Kings, whom God hath invested with such a power.

I: But say they Kings are Gods, and therfore are not accountable for any actions they doe, and the Scripture calls them so.

Answ. It is true, the Scripture doth so: yet none I beleeve will be so blasphemous as to say they are *Iehovah*, such as have an infinite being of and from themselves from all eternity: They will at most confesse them to be but *Elohim*, and this name of God is communicable, and is oftentimes in Scripture applyed unto other creatures, both Angels and Men; yet not to such Men only as have Kingly dignity, but unto all Rulers and Governours whatsoever: as we may see *Psal.* 82. 1. where it is said, *God stands in the Congregation of the mighty, he judgeth among the Gods.* And in the words following, the Psalmist incites, and stirres them up to the performance of their duties, in their place saying, *How long will ye judge unjustly, and accept the persons of the wicked; defend the poore and fatherlesse, doe justice to the afflicted and needy, deliver the poore and needie, rid them out of the hand of the wicked.* Then in the 6. verse againe he saith, *I have said ye are gods* &c. In all this here we see there is not a word spoken of Kings in particular, but generally this phrase is applyed unto all Rulers and Magistrates whatsoever: and besides we know that the duties before spoken of, are proper to them as well as unto Kings. Moreover, I doe not know in all the Scriptures, where this word *Elohim* is so particularly applyed unto Kings as it so be in regard thereof, they should be lesse accountable for their actions then any other Rulers. So then if this be true, as we plainly out of Scripture see it is, that other Rulers as well as Kings are called Gods, then Kings as well as other Rulers are accountable for their actions, unlesse that we will say that all Rulers and Governours whatsoever are not accountable unto men for what they doe.

But say they Kings are the *highest powers* on earth how then can they be accountable unto those that are inferiour and under them, which is not accidentall unto other Rulers and Governours becaus there are higher above them that they may give accompt unto: but none are above Kings: therfore they are to give accompt to none, save only God.

Anſ. I deny that Kings on earth are the *highest powers*, and this I say, that the Kingdome is above the King, and so consequently the representative body therof, the whole power of all the body of the people of the Land, being by generall consent transmitted over unto it; and I prove it thus: The *end* is alwayes greater then the *meanes*, or the *meanes* are subordinate to the *end*, and therfore must needs be inferiour, for the *meanes* could never have bin but for such or such an *end* for which they were appointed: no wise man that understands what he saith will deny, but that the *cause* is *greater* then the *effect*: but Kings were ordained for this *end*; they were chosen and appointed both by God and Man, to be a *meanes* for procuring of the good and welfare of their King-

 domes,

domes, and had there bin no people, there had bin no Kings: by which it appeares, that Kings have their dependance upon their People, and that they were the primary *cause*, and Kings but the *effects* proceeding from them: therfore their Kingdomes are *greater* then they; and so consequently the representative bodies therof. And surely there is somwhat in it too, that Kings are call'd the Ministers and Servants of the State, and so all good Kings and Governours have acknowledged themselvs to be.

Then againe, Kings are but the *ordinance of Man*, as the Apostle shews, 1 *Pet.*2.13. *Submit your selves to every ordinance of man for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King as supreme.* Where the Apostle gives us this exhortation, to submit to Kings though they be the ordinance of man. Now will any say that they which doe infuse a power into others, are inferiour unto them into whom they doe infuse it; that the power electing is inferiour to the power elected; that the originall is inferiour to the consequence; that the fountain head is inferiour to the streams that flow from it? I beleeve there are none that are in their right sences will say it. So then, if the people are the originall of that power that is in Kings, and that the power they have is borrowed from them, as the streams flow from the Fountain, let any judge whether is greater the King or his people. Not any particular person among the people, nor any particular Corporations or Assemblies therof but the whole body of the people I say considered together; or those that by especiall consent of all the people do represent the whole.

But here it may be said, How say you that Kings are the *ordinance of man*, doth not the Apostle once and againe *Rom.*13.1,&c. call all Rulers, and so consequently Kings *the ordinance of God*? *Let every soule be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordained of God: Whosoever therfore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God*, &c. If they be the ordinance of God, how be they the ordinance of Men then?

Answ. Here give me leave to aske one Question: Say any Politie or State chuse any kind of Government, whether Kings, or Dukes or Judges, or the like, and by generall consent for the good of the people they establish it by Law, is not this then a *humane ordinance*, this or that kind of Government that they have chosen; yet I suppose you will not deny but that this is the *ordinance of God*, that now they should submit themselvs thereto? Therfore the Apostle speaking concerning Magistrates in *Rom.* 13. saith not a word concerning Kings, as if they were more a divine Ordinance then other Rulers, but in generall terms, he saith, *that all rulers whatsoever are of God*: But when he comes to speak of Kings in particular, as he doth 1 *Pet.*2.13. he calls them the *ordinance of man*, wherby he doth as it were comment upon, and explain the meaning of those words of S. *Paul*, *Rom.*13. as if he should have said thus: It is true, Power, Magistracie, and Government *is the ordinance of God*, and by divine institution: but so are not Kings, nor this, nor that, nor any other kind of government, they are of man, and through his appointment. So that I say Kings, for their kind of government, are the ordinance of man: For God hath not tied any people in his Word, that they shall be governed by Kings, or by Dukes, or by Judges, or Estates, or the like, but referres that unto themselvs for their choice, according as they shall see most convenient for their good and prosperity; but when this or that kind of government is ordained and established by generall consent of the people, this is *the ordinance of God*, which the Apostle gives a charge, *that every one be subject unto* (according to the old saying, *Vox Populi, vox Dei*. The voice of the people is Gods voice) *which they that resist shall receive to themselvs damnation*. So that still you see there is a power on earth above Kings (as I said before)

which

which lies in the generallity of the people, from whence they doe receive as from their Fountain head their Soveraignty and Kingly dignitie.

Now then from what hath bin said, followes this consequence of necessitie, that if there be a greater power on earth then Kings are, Then Kings are accountable for their actions therunto, and ought to be subject as well as others, as appeares by that in *Rom.* 13 1. *Let every soule be subje to the higher powers, for there is no power but of* God, *the powers that be are ordained of* God, &c. *Whosoever therfore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of* God, *and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.* In which words we see the Apostle gives a generall charge to all inferiours to submit themselves to their superiours: therfore if Kings be inferiour to their Kingdomes, and so consequently to the representative bodies therof; then Kings ought by vertue of this charge, to be subject thereunto as well as others.

But how ought they to submit, what? in doing only, and in matter of obedience, are they discharged there, so as though they abuse their power never so exorbitantly, to spoile, oppresse, and destroy their people, censure may not passe upon them, nor punishment be inflicted? surely I find no such distinction in all the word of God: Nay, we are commanded the contrary, and the law of nature teacheth us as much, that if there be a festred and a gangreen'd member in the body, that would destroy the whole, to cut it off for the preservation of the whole.

I, it is true will they say, if there be any festred or corrupted member in the body that would destroy the whole, we ought to cut it off, rather then to suffer all the body to perish, the Law of God and nature teacheth us thus much: but in case the head should have any Gangreene in it, and you cut that off, you doe immediatly destroy the body; the life can not be preserved when the Head is gone. So in like manner, the King he is the Head of the State, and in that respect he hath such an influence upon the State that if you cut Him off, you destroy the whole State together with Him, as you destroy the body when you take away the head therof: therfore be he never so wicked, He is to be suffered and borne withall.

Answ. This similitude or resemblance here doth not hold good, therfore we must distinguish between a naturall head, and a civill head: for if the naturall head of the body of man be taken away, the body dies: but it is not so with the civill Head of the State, as experience doth sufficiently shew by the death of Kings. But if it were possible in the body of man, when one head is taken away to find another to put in his place, and so to preserve the life as it may be done in the State, surely Heads would oftentimes be changed, and cut off as well as other members. So that if we will thus reason, that the Head of the State should be in respect of His body, as the head of man in respect of the body of man, then it doth necessarily follow, that the Head being dead, the body should die also, as is manifest in the body of man. But it doth not hold so in the head of the State, as it doth in the head of the body of man, that if the head of the State be cut off, the State dies, as doth the body of man: therfore the King who is the Head of the State, if a corrupted and a festred Member, that may indanger the destruction of the body of the State, ought to be cut off, for the preservation of the whole, for, *Salus populi suprema Lex:* nothing ought to be so much regarded as the Peoples safety, which is the end of all Law and government whatsoever.

This similitude, though it hold not good as it is above proposed, yet it doth in the contrary, that if a King by his wicked and Tyrannicall courses, doth destroy his Kingdome, he doth destroy himselfe, as when the naturall body is destroyed, the head of necessity must perish with it.

I but will ſome ſay this is ſtrange, Where in all the Scripture doe you find that the people have with Gods likeing and approbation ſo much as reſiſted their Kings, how much leſſe cenſured them, or brought them to tryall or puniſhment, for any actions that ever they have done?

For the firſt of theſe I Anſwer, that Kings in their wicked and ungodly courſes have bin reſiſted by their people, the Spirit of God ſpeaking by way of commendation of them for it, or at leaſt wiſe not diſapproving the ſame. This is evident by divers places of Scripture; As firſt of all we have an example hereof in *Ionathans* caſe, 1 *Sam.*14 44. where becauſe that *Ionathan* had eaten a little Honey, contrary to the Commandement of his Father *Saul*, who was then King of *Iſrael*, he would have put him to death; thereupon the people ſtand up in his juſt defence, againſt *Saul* his Father, ſaying, *Shall Ionathan die who hath wrought this great ſalvation in Iſrael*, God *forbid, as the Lord lives there ſhall not one haire of his head fall to the ground, for he hath wrought with* God *this day.* Then it followes, *the people reſcued Ionathan that he died not.* Did they not think you reſiſt *Saul*, when the people reſcued him out of his hand whether he would or no, and contrary to the Oath that he had ſworne?

Secondly, we have the example of *David* in *Keilah*, 1 *Sam.* 23. 7 &c. where *David* being at *Keilah*, and *Saul* hearing of it, thought he had got now his oportunity to take him, that he might kill him, as oftentimes he had before indeavoured: but it ſo pleaſed God, that this came to *Davids* eares, that *Saul* ſecretly practiſed miſchief againſt him, to come and take away his life. Hereupon *David* inquires of God, Firſt to know whether it were ſo or no, as that *Saul* would come down to *Keilah*? God anſwers him that he would. Therupon the ſecond time he asks him *Whether the men of Keilah would deliver him and his men into the hand of Saul, or no?* God anſwers him that he would deliver him up. By this laſt it doth clearly appeare, that if ſo be the Keilites would have bin true to *David*, and have ſtood to him, he would have maintained the Town againſt *Saul*, and have defended himſelfe in it: otherwiſe, why ſhould *David* aske God the ſecond time, *Whether the men of Keilah would deliver him up and his men into the hands of Saul, or no?* he might have gone his way, when that he heard *Saul* would come down, without asking any more queſtions, unleſſe we will ſay that the ſecond queſtion, which *David* propounded to aske of God, was frivolous and vaine, and ſo conſequently the anſwer that God gave it; which I ſuppoſe there are none will be ſo bold as to affirme. (This was the very caſe of Sir *Iohn Hotham* in *Hull*, who for this very action His Majeſtie was pleaſed to Proclaime him Traytor.)

Then againe, it may be further ſaid of *David*, if he had not had a purpoſe to have reſiſted *Saul* in caſe of exigency, and extremity, what did he with 600. men about him? he might have fled from *Saul* when he was coming towards him, without ſuch a train and guard of men attending him, and ſo have ſaved himſelfe without them. Nay, he might in all probability have eſcaped his hands better, for had he not had ſo many with him, he might have kept himſelfe the more cloſe, and ſecret, ſo that he could not have bin ſo eaſily diſcovered. And beſides this, we read 1 *Chron.*12.22. that *There came to David to help him before Sauls death an hoaſt, like the hoaſt of* God: and what? was all this preparation and aſſiſtance for nothing?

One more example I will bring out of the Scriptures, and that is of King *Vzziah*, 2 *Chron.*26 16. who incroached upon the Office of the Prieſts, and would take upon him to offer Incenſe in the Temple of the Lord, contrary to the expreſſe commandement of God: whereupon it is ſaid in the 17. verſe, that *Azariah the Prieſt went in after him,*

him, and with him foure score Priests of the Lord, that were valiant men, and they withstood Vzziah the King, and said unto him, it pertaineth not to thee Vzziah to burn Incense unto the Lord, but to the Priests the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense; goe out of the Sanctuary, for thou hast trespassed, neither shall it be for thine honour from the Lord God. Then Vzziah was wroth, and had a Censour in his hand to burn Incense: and while he was wroth with the Priests, the Leprosie even rose upon his forehead, before the Priests in the house of the Lord, besides the Incense altar. Then Azariah the chief Priest, and all the Priests looking upon him, and beholding that he was leprous in his forehead, thrust him out from thence. If this be not resistance, I know not what is.

Besides all this, the more to stoppe the mouthes of such ill affected persons in our times, that will take upon them to make much more of Kings, then ever God made or did intend, there are examples even in the Primitive times among the Christians, who have resisted their Kings in their sinfull and unlawfull actions. As to instance in *Lycinius* the Emperour, who had granted to the Christians to injoy their Religion, yet afterwards turning persecutor, they sent for *Constantine* the great to assist them against him, and overthrew him. And againe being persecuted by the King of *Persia*, the Christians sent for *Theodosius* the Emperour to help them against him. And I doubt not but if the Ecclesiasticall Histories of those times were searched, there might more examples of this nature be found out.

But besides all this, we have seen and known the like in our own times, as lately in the Scots, whom the King himselfe, that now is, acquitted, when he came to a right understanding. So the Protestants in *France*, *England* all Queen *Elizabeths dayes did help* them. In our dayes again, in King *Charles* his own reigne, we sent over a great Force, in shew at least, to help *Rochel* against the King of *France*. So in High *Iermanie*, the Princes there maintain their right against *Charles* the 5, and were helped by *France* and *England*. In the *Neather-Lands* it is evident from the beginning. Now shall we take upon us to condemn all these Churches for so doing?

Then for the second, which is the principall point here in dispute, Whether Kings in case they doe Tyrannize over their People Oppresse, Spoile and Destroy their Subjects, and doe other such like wicked and unnaturall actions, may have Censure and Punishment inflicted upon them, according to the nature of their severall Offences? They say where is there any example or expresse command in Scripture for this?

Answ. It is true, there are no examples, or Commands in Scripture for this particular case, or at least not as I know of; yet that matters not, so long as we have a rule to walk by, and Commands in generall that reach to all particulars. And for this the like may very well be said, as may for Parents murthering of their Children, there is no direct Law set down, either divine or humane, for the punishment of such, the thing is so detestable and contrary to very nature, that it may be conceived, that there would be none such found: but if there be, there are generall Laws in force for their censure and punishment, as in case of Murther; and by how much the nearer the relation is, the greater being the bond and tye for procuring the peace and welfare of such and such parties, so much the greater is the offence, and so much the more liable are they to punishment. So I say, though there are no particular Laws set down, for the correcting and punishing of such Kings and Princes, as doe Oppresse, Spoile and Destroy their People, yet so much is included in those generall Laws both of God and Man; and so much the more liable are they to Censure and punishment, by how much they are Ordained, to be greater instruments of the good and well being of their People then

others

others are. (For this is the very nature and being of a King, He is such a one as *cares* and *provides* for the Commonwealth, takes *pleasure* in the *commodity* and *profit* of His Subjects; and in all his doings hath respect to the *prosperity* of those over whom He ruleth.) Now what those generall Laws are, it is well known; As for example, This God hath said, *He that sheds mans blood, by man shall his blood be shed*, Gen. 9 6. And *He that blasphemes the Name of the* Lord, *shall surely be put to death*. Levit. 24 16. And again, *If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosome, or thy friend, which is as thine own soule*, (the King himself may be within the compasse of these, or most of these relations, as the case is put) *intice thee secretly, saying, let us goe and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers, thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him, neither shall thine eye pitty him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him, but thou shalt surely kill him, thine hand shal be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people, and thou shalt stone him with stones that he dye*, Deut. 13.6. &c. In which words the Spirit of God plainly shews, that in this case, the greatest and neareſt relation of friendship, love and duty, that we can owe to any whatsoever they be, of what dignity or degree soever should not make us desist from the execution of Justice. These things are spoken you see without the least exception that may be, that in case the Rulers or the King should do thus, that the like should not be done unto them: but God requires that Equity and Justice be done alike upon all without respect of persons; as we well know that this is the charge that God hath given *Deut.* 16.19. *Thou shalt not wrest judgement, thou shalt not respect persons*. Where God shews thus much unto us, that to respect the persons of any in matter of Judgement, or Justice, is to wrest Justice, and to goe aside from that which is right. God will have equall and impartiall judgement administred alike unto all: And the reason hereof is given by the Holyghost in the place before cited, *Deut.* 13.11. *That all Israel may heare and feare, and doe no more any such wickednesse*. Now there is none that will deny, but that Kings by nature are as bad as any, and are subject to be worse then any others, by reason of those Flatterers and evill Counsellours, that usually are about them. as we may see in the examples of *Ioash*, 2 *Chron.* 24 17. and of *Rehoboam*, 2 *Chron.* 10.8 &c. should it be so then that there were no Laws in force binding unto them as well as unto Us, and examples of true and equall Justice made upon them as well as upon others, it were the very next way to open a pappe to all Kings and Princes to all manner of wickednesse and licentiousnes, and to make them Tyrants that otherwise would be good and gracious towards their People. Wheras this would be a very good meanes to keep Kings in as well as others, from running into such extravagant courses to the dishonour of God, and the destruction of their people as usually they are wont to doe; unlesse we will say that God hath given unto Kings, and Princes a dispensation above all others. to run headlong unto Hell without controule. They that teach such Doctrine, by this now it appeares, what friends they are unto them. whatsoever they may pretend, who would make Kings of all others the most *miserable*, by ascribing unto them an unrestrained liberty to all wickednesse whatsoever to their destruction.

But here comes in another Objection, for will some say againe, *Kings are Gods anoynted*: therfore men may not question them. much lesse may they touch their lives whatsoever their actions be: And thus much saith David concerning *Saul*, who was *King* of *Israel* though he were a wicked King. and his enemy that sought his life; and that for no just cause neither; yet when David had an opportunity to slay him, 1 *Sam.* 24 6. he speaks thus, *The Lord forbid that I should doe this thing unto my Master the Lords anointed*,

to

to ſtretch forth mine hand againſt him, ſeeing he is the anointed of the Lord. So againe, 1 *Sam.* 26.9. *Who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the Lords anointed and be guiltleſſe?*

To this I anſwer, *David* was a private man (notwithſtanding he was *Sauls* ſucceſſor by Gods appointment to the Crowne) and ſo had no warrant to doe ſuch a thing as this as to take away the life of *Saul* the King, though hee had done him, or ſhould ſeeke to doe him never ſo much harm. For in a caſe farre Inferiour to this, wee know that if a private man be a Thiefe, and by Law is condemned to die, yet no man may lay violent hands upon him to take away his life, but onely in a Legall way, and by the executioner that is by authority appointed for this purpoſe, if any man ſhould, hee would be accounted a murtherer for ſo doing, and bee liable to ſuffer the Law in that caſe provided. So then if this cannot bee juſtifiable upon a private perſon condemned by Law much leſſe then upon a publike perſon, eſpecially ſuch a one as a King is, and uncondemned too. Therfore in this caſe had *David* taken away *Sauls* life, who was then King of *Iſrael*, he had bin much to blame, and had ſinned exceedingly in the ſight of God, wherfore *David* would not doe it.

But we doe not know what *David* would have done, or what he might have done, in caſe *Saul* ſhould forceibly have come upon him to have taken away his life, in his own juſt defence for his own ſafety and preſervation: for elſe for what end had *David* thoſe 600. men with him? Surely it will be anſwered, and I beleeve the moſt malignant among them all will not deny it, that he had them for his Defence; was it ſo? Then truly I think that they that will defend themſelvs, by Arms and armed men, muſt needs offend, when they are offended. For this is a meere conceipt that even very children will be ready to laugh at, to ſay that when a mans enemy comes againſt him to doe him a miſchief he muſt only defend himſelfe, but muſt not ſtrike againe. For how is this poſſible, for a man to defend himſelfe from his enemy, and yet not offend his enemy?

Then for aſmuch as *Kings* are call'd *the anointed of the Lord*; they are ſo call'd in two reſpects. Firſt either in regard of the Anointing Oyle that was powred upon them, by the performance of which Ceremonie they were inaugurized into their Functions and Offices. Or elſe in regard of that authority, which by their people they are elected unto, whereby they become Gods Deputies and Vicegerents here on earth, in ruling and governing of his people.

For the firſt of theſe, in aſmuch as *Kings* are call'd *the anointed of the Lord*, becauſe of the Anointing Oyle that was powred upon them, by the performance of which Ceremony they were inaugurized into their Functions, whereof ſome there were that God did in a more eſpeciall manner thus inſtitute and ordaine, even by His own immediate appointment, as to wit *Saul*, *David*, *Solomon*, *Iehu*, and *Hazael*, whom he commanded *Elijah* to Anoynt *King* over *Syria*. Yet I ſee no ground, nor reaſon, why even theſe ſhould not be reſponſall to the Lawes and to their *Kingdomes*, for their Actions. For I do not perceive that God did any whit hereby exempt them from the obſervance of his Laws, either Actively or paſſively. If not, then ſurely they that would attribute thus much unto them, doe exalt and ſet them above the Laws and Commandements of God (for you muſt underſtand that the judiciall Laws in thoſe times, whereby God would have his people to bee governed, were immediately ordained of God, as well as any other Laws whatſoever) which therfore for my own part I conceive to be no leſſe then blaſphemy; at leaſt I am ſure it is a high contempt of Gods ordinance. Wherfore now (with ſubmiſſion to better judgements) wheras it is ſaid, *Who can ſtretch forth his hand*

againſt

againſt the Lords anointed and be guiltleſſe, I ſuppoſe this to be the meaning of it: That this is a thing not to be raſhly or unadviſedly done by any, and that it belongs to none but to the Magiſtrates only, and that in a legall way, having herein an awfull and reverentiall regard of the Commandement of God.

Yet further I will not deny but that it may probably be, that there may be ſomwhat extraordinary in the caſe of theſe 5 Kings before mentioned, their perſons being of Gods immediate choice, and by his eſpeciall appointment inducted into that Function, as the rather it ſeems ſo to be, becauſe this term of the *Lords anointed*, I find it applyed in Scripture to no King elſe that was anointed with Oyle, but only theſe, though we read of divers Kings elſe beſides theſe, that were anointed with Oyle.

Then for the other, in that Kings are called *Gods anointed* with reſpect to the *authority*, which by their people they are elected unto, whereby they become Gods Deputies and Vicegerents here on earth, in ruling and governing of his people. Thus, and no otherwiſe then thus are our Kings call'd the Anointed of the Lord: Now as much as this is proper and belonging to other Rulers as well as to Kings, to be called Gods Deputies and Vicegerents, and therefore it is that they, as I ſhewed before, are cal'd Gods as well as Kings, which little is applyed unto them, in this regard, becauſe they repreſent the place of God, and have his Image ſtamped upon them in a more eſpeciall manner, by meanes of that authority that God, by the conſent of his people hath conferred upon them for their good: From hence therefore neither doe I ſee any ground, why Kings ſhould not be accountable for their actions. For if ſo be that they are not accountable in this regard becauſe they are Gods Deputies and Vicegerents, why then I ſay, nor any other Rulers, nor Magiſtrates beſides, becauſe they are Gods Vicegerents as well as Kings? The which, I thinke there are none will be ſo ſimple as to affirme.

So now by what hath been ſaid, we ſee that even Kings in a legall way may bee reſiſted, neither do we want examples among our ſelves of this kind, and yet it is thought no grievance or unlawfull thing, or unbeſeeming the profeſſion of good Chriſtians, as ſome doe ſay. For it is not manifeſt that the King himſelfe is impleaded by his owne Subjects, and hath many times tryalls at Law with them at the Kings bench, and is divers times too overthrowne: And if this be done in ſlighter matters, then certainely much more it ought to be done in matters, of farre greater weight and conſequence, as in caſes of oppreſſion, Tyranny, or Deſtruction of his People.

But here againe ſay they, ſhould wee grant you this, that other Kings may be reſiſted, as you have declared, and may Legally bee accountable for their actions, yet the caſe is not alike betweene other Kings and ours of *England*, for as much as they have their right to the Crown by Conqueſt, as is evident by *William* the Conquerour, whoſe Succeſſors they are, and therefore there is no other way for us now, but either to obey what they command us, or elſe to ſubmit our ſelves to ſuffer.

Anſw. It goes beyond my apprehenſion to conceive, how this kind of arguing can hold good, and I do admire upon what ground it ſhould be built. But beſides it is not here amiſſe, to take notice of the baſeneſſe and ſervility of the ſpirits of theſe men, who can be ſo well content to argue themſelves into a very vaſſalage and ſlavery: Therfore for ſatisfaction in this point as well as in the reſt, wee muſt take notice that there is a two fold conqueſt, one is Abſolute, and the other is Conditionall. For the firſt of theſe, will they affirme it, that we are abſolutely conquered, and ſo overcom by an altogether over-ruling and Tyrannicall power that our Lives, Perſons and Eſtates, lie at the mercy of the Conqueror, all that ever we have being at his will and pleaſure, that hee may

make

make a prey of them how he liſt, and when he liſt; without any bonds or ties at all on his part towards his people, but that by vertue of the Conqueſt, we are wholly become his Vaſſalls and ſlaves: I ſay in this caſe a people may by force of Armes, nay they are bound to doe it (for as much as all people ought both by the Law of God and nature to provide for their owne welfare and ſalvation) when they have a fit and convenient opportunity, and ſtrength ſufficient, to reſcue themſelves from under the power of ſuch a Tyranny, and free themſelves from ſuch a Yoake, though it ſhould bee even with the perſonall deſtruction of thoſe Kings, that ſhould uſurpe ſuch a power over them. And I prove it clearely by the examples of the people of God in the times of the *Iudges*, approved by the Spirit of God; as, *Iudg.* 3. 8. Iſrael there rebelled againſt the Lord, by turning unto Idolls, whereupon it is ſaid, *the anger of the Lord was hot againſt Iſrael, and he ſold them into the hands of* Cuſhan Riſhathaim *King of* Meſopotamia, *and the Children of Iſrael ſerved* Cuſhan Riſhathaim *eight yeeres* (that is to ſay, they ſerved him in a ſervile ſlaviſh way) then it followes, *that the Children of Iſraell cryed unto the Lord, and the Lord rayſed up a deliverer unto the Children of Iſrael, who delivered them, even* Othniel *the brother of* Kenaz, Kalebs *younger brother, and the ſpirit of the Lord came upon him, and he judged Iſrael, and went out to warre, and the Lord delivered* Cuſhan Riſhathaim, *into his hand, and his hand prevailed againſt* Cuſhan Riſhathaim, *and ſo the* Land *had reſt 40 Yeeres.*

By which words you ſee, that the people of God by force of Armes were violently overcome, and kept powerfully under a Tyranny, for the ſpace of eight yeeres but ſee when God had raiſed up unto them a deliverer, that is to ſay, one that would ſtand up in defence of them againſt the King of *Meſopotamia*, who had them under, and they now had a convenient opportunity to redeeme themſelves from under this Tyranny, they take it; and by force of Armes recover their liberty againe. It is needleſſe to inſtance in any more particulars at large, I will therefore onely point out the ſeverall places, that for your better ſatisfaction you may read them at your leaſure. The enſuing Story doth manifeſtly prove it beginning at the 12. *verſe*, &c. ſo againe, *Iudges* 4. the whole Chapter is a Story to this purpoſe: This is cleare alſo in the example of *Gideon, who delivered Iſrael from the hand of the* Midianites, the Story is in the 6. and 7. Chap. of *Iudges*. It is cleare alſo by the example of *Ieptha, who delivered Iſrael from the hand of the* Ammonites, *Iudges* the 19. and 11. *Chapters*. So much in briefe may be ſaid concerning abſolute Conqueſt. And now I hope they will take heed, how they ſay, we were abſolutely conquered. Then for the other, and that is Conditionall Conqueſt. So ſay they we were Conquered, and it is not denyed: That is to ſay; when *William* the Conquerour invaded the Land, we were content to ſubmit our ſelves unto him, (for the prevention of blood ſhed and deſtruction, that otherwiſe might have enſued) to ſerve him as our Liege Lord, and Soveraigne, ſo that he would promiſe to govern us, according to theſe and theſe Laws and Cuſtomes, to which covenant hee conſented, as all the Kings of *England* have done ſince. And ſo we are become not his ſlaves to be deſtroyed at his pleaſure, but his Subjects, having ſworne him and his Succeſſours Allegiance upon theſe conditions. If this be ſo; then here we plainely ſee, we are not bound to ſubmit to the Kings will and pleaſure, in all his commands, but onely ſo farre forth as hee commands according to his Laws, which is the condition upon which we ſweare him Allegiance, and become his Subjects. Therefore if the conditions of the Covenant be broke, and inſtead of governing his people by his Lawes, he rules them as hee liſt, according to his will and pleaſure; is it not manifeſt, that the King doth abſolve his Subjects from their Allegiance, nor are they any longer, legally bound to obey

him. For this every one knowes, that when the condition, whereby the Covenant is tied to each partie, is broken, the Covenant it selfe by vertue thereof is quite dissolved, or at least dissolvable at the parties pleasure with whom the Covenant was made. By this it appeares that the King is as much bound to the Subjects as the Subjects to the King, and that in this case the Subjects may make lawfull resistance to recover their undoubted Liberties and Priviledges, and yet not bee termed Rebells against their Prince. For none but they only can be called or esteemed such, as violate their oathes of Allegiance, which we do not, if the King break with us his Covenant, wherby he hath bound himselfe to us and upon performance whereof we sweare him Allegiance.

But now besides all that hath bin said, let us a little look into the foul absurdities that follow upon this tenent, that people must so submit themselves unto their Kings, as either to obey their commands, though never so unlawfull, or else to suffer whatsoever they shall inflict upon them, and not to take up defensive Armes against them: but in case their Kings come against them in a hostile manner seeking their destruction; all that they must doe say they, is to runne away from them. But, say they doe so, they may so follow and persue their people, or incompasse them in that they can be able to runne no further, so that then they must either perforce stand upon their defence, or submit themselves unto their mercy. Why? I say they, so they must. all the weapons they must use in this case are prayers and teares. So that then, if *Nero* like they should wish that the whole body of their people were but one necke, that hee might cut them off at one blow, they must as we say, lay their necks upon the block, and submit themselves to their owne destruction. And so now consequently it follows, be their *Kings* never so great Tyrants, not onely over their bodies, but over their soules too (as the case may be, they may set up Popery and Idolatry in their Kingdomes, as the Kings of *Israel* and *Iudah* did: nay if they will, bring in very Heathenisme, and what not, utterly depriving their people of all the outward happinesse, and comfort of their lives, and also as much as in them lies, prostituting their soules to utter ruine, by denying them the meanes of their salvation) yet they may not doe any thing in this case to help themselvs by way of just defence or Legall Justice. If this be so, then indeed we are beholding only to the Kings good nature, for every thing that we have and do enjoy, and not at all unto the Laws, and that will proove good doctrine that hath not long since bin so freely taught among us, That our lives, our Liberties, our Estates, our Wives and our Children, and all we have, are at the Kings mercy, and that wee doe injoy any of these, it is of his meer favor and bounty towards us: And then what need at all is there of any Laws or why should the Parliament trouble themselvs to make any more Statutes or Ordinances, wherby to govern us? the which how ridiculous it is, and how abominably falle, and contrary to Gods word, you have already heard.

It will not be improper for this discourse to look a little into the case and condition, which wicked King *Ahaz* brought his people into by his abominable Idolatry which he established in the land, 2 *Chron.* 20. 3. It is said, *He burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and burnt his children in the fire, after the abominations of the heathen, whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel. He sacrificed also and burnt incense in the high places, and on hills, and under every green tree: wherfore the* Lord *his God*, it is said, *delivered him into the hand of the King of Syria, and they smote him* (that is to say, his people) *and carryed away a great multitude of them captive, and brought them to Damascus; and he was also delivered into the hand of the King of Israel, who smote him with a great slaughter. For Peca the sonne of Remaliah slew in Iudah* 12000 *in one day, which were all valiant men*: and the reason follows,

because

becauſe they had forſaken the Lord God of their fathers. By whoſe meanes was this that they had done it, was it not by reaſon of their Idolatrous King *Ahaz?* Then in the 8. verſe, *the children of Iſrael carryed away captive of them* 200000. *women, ſons and daughters, and took alſo away much ſpoile from them, and brought the ſpoile to Samaria.* Againe in the 16. verſe, *Ahaz ſends to the King of Syria to help him againſt the Edomites that came and ſmote Iudah, who carryed them away captive; the Philiſtims alſo had invaded the Cities of the low Countries, and of the ſouth of Iuaah, and had taken divers Townes from them,* as there they are reckoned up, *and dwelt there:* for it is ſaid, *The Lord brought Iudah low becauſe of Ahaz King of Iſrael, for he had made Iudah naked, and tranſgreſſed ſore againſt the Lord.* So in the 20. verſe againe it is ſaid, *That Tilgath Pilnezer, King of Aſſyria came unto him, and diſtreſſed him, but ſtrengthned him not, for Ahaz took a portion out of the houſe of the Lord, and out of the houſe of the King, and of the Princes, and gave it unto the King of Aſſyria, but he helped him not.* There you ſee was alſo ſo much of the treaſure of the land loſt. Again it is ſaid, *that in the time of his diſtreſſe he did treſpaſſe yet more againſt the* Lord. (This is that King *Ahaz,*) *for he ſacrificed unto the Gods of Damaſcus which ſmote him:* and he ſaid, *becauſe the Gods of the Kings of Syria helpe them, therefore will I ſacrifice to them, that they may help me:* but they were the ruine of him, and of all *Iſrael.* To this lamentable condition was *Iſrael* now brought, through the wickedneſſe of this man. How much better had it bin for them to have executed the judgement of the Lord upon him, who in his moſt juſt and righteous Law required, *that all Idolaters,* without reſpect of perſons *ſhould be deſtroyed;* and had given more then an ordinary charge concerning this particular, then, by the neglect of the execution of *juſtice,* to have brought themſelvs to that miſerable condition wherin they were, both in reſpect of their ſoules and bodies. And who knows whether God might not lay the heavier load upon them, for this their contempt, in not obeying his Commandement; whereas if to be they had done this, they might ſtill have continued in the favour of God and bin a bleſſed and renowned people as their predeceſſours were.

But if it ſhall be ſaid, Why did they not execute *juſtice* in this kind upon him, and other their Idolatrous Kings, it ſeems there was ſomwhat more then ordinary in it, in that it was omitted?

I anſwer. It was no marvaile they did neglect the execution of *juſtice* in this regard upon their Kings, when as they were ſo careleſſe to doe it upon common and private perſons: for we never read that ever there was ſo much as any one perſon, after they were come into the promiſed poſſeſſion of the Land of *Canaan,* that they did put to death for their Idolatry, of what kind or condition ſoever they were: and if this were thus omitted upon perſons of ordinary and mean ranke and qualitie, how ſhould it be expected that it ſhould be executed upon their Kings.

Yet beſides all this that hath bin ſaid, to ſhew the unreaſonableneſſe and falſeneſſe of this Depoſition (*that Kings are unaccountable for their actions, and may not be reſiſted, though they doe thoſe things that are never ſo diſhonourable to God, and prejudiciall and hurtfull to their Subjects*) there may ſomwhat more be ſaid with reference to the Wiſdome of God. For how is it poſſible to be imagined, that He who is ſo *infinitely wiſe* (having in His *unſearchable underſtanding* appointed Government as the only meanes for his peoples happy and well being here on earth, ſhould leave His people in ſuch a condition, that if ſo be the meanes and inſtruments, which he hath ordained for their good, ſhould riſe up againſt them to their *deſtruction,* they ſhould have no power left them to help themſelvs, nor meanes to provide for their own ſafety, but muſt be faine to ſubmit themſelvs to their wills and pleaſures. How doth this exceedingly reflect upon the Wiſdome and

Providence of God; and is it not manifeſt and apparent that Gods ends and intentions in Government are hereby quite fruſtrated and void. ſo as that, that which he hath appointed for his peoples greateſt benefit and ſecurity, ſhould turn to their greateſt hurt and miſchief. And this were the next way, inſtead of making God the *authour of peace*, 1 *Cor.*14 33. to make him the chieſeſt authour of all diſorder and confuſion. For let any man judge that hath but the ordinary underſtanding of a man, if this be not occaſion ſufficient to make even the beſt of Kings (if God doe not give them more then an ordinary meaſure of his Grace) to become Tyrants, and to live as they liſt, when they are perſwaded that they may doe what they liſt, and none may controule them.

Therfore for the more full clearing of that which hath bin already ſaid, it will not be amiſſe to ſearch a little narrowly into the meaning of that place, *Rom.*13.1 &c. and ſo to acquaint our ſelves what that *power* is, which the Apoſtle there calls *the ordinance of God*, *Let every ſoule be ſubject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordain'd of God.* They are Magiſtrates that are here meant by theſe *powers*, and theſe *powers* the Apoſtle ſaith *are of God.* Now I aske, did ever God give a *power* unto any for the deſtruction of his people, and of thoſe that are committed to their charge? is this the Ordinance of God for Kings and Rulers to ſeek the undoing and ruine of their people? Surely no. God did appoint them for his peoples good, as before was ſhewed; and thus much alſo the Apoſtle declares to us here in the words following, verſe 3. *Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evill. Wilt thou not be afraid of the power? doe that which is good and thou ſhalt have praiſe of the ſame. for he is the miniſter of God to thee for good*, &c. (Here by the way this ſhews unto us, that the acts of Kings for the good of their people, are not acts of Grace, as ſome flatterers would make them, but they are acts of Dutie, which God requires from them towards their people.)

And beſides, let us have a reſpect unto Kings and Governours too, as they are a *humane ordinance*, as the Apoſtle calls them, as you heard before, 1 *Pet.*2.13, &c. Did ever the people who elected them, give them any ſuch power as to rule them according to their *wills* and *pleaſures*? If they have, what made they thoſe good Laws for, according to which they Covenanted for to govern them? And therfore as the Apoſtle before ſaith, *they are the ordinance of God* with reſpect to their peoples good; ſo here the Apoſtle ſaith, *they are the ordinance of man* with reſpect to the ſame: For ſo he ſaith, *Submit your ſelves to every ordinance of man for the Lords ſake, whether unto the King as ſupreme, or unto Governours, as they that are ſent by him*; What for? Or to what end? (ſurely not for their deſtruction, but to be inſtruments of their well being, for ſo it followes) *for the puniſhment of evill doers, and for the praiſe of them that doe well.* Therfore hence I ſay, If Kings who are Ordained by God, and Choſen by Men, for this *end*, to be inſtruments of *good* to their People, doe contrarily abuſe their Authority, wherewithall they are intruſted both by God and Man, to the *hurt* and *deſtruction* of their People: if in this caſe the People to preſerve themſelvs doe ſtand upon their own Defence, and take up Armes for their own *protection*, they do not *reſiſt the ordinance of* God, nor come within the reach of the Apoſtles cenſure, as thoſe that for ſo doing *ſhall receive damnation.*

Here is one thing yet more that I have to ſay concerning the Unlimited Prerogative, and ſo I ſhall finiſh this Diſcourſe; and that is, What good can there come by aſcribing ſuch a Power? For every circumſtance in point of Government muſt have reſpect unto ſome *good* or other, either for the *glory of* God, or for the *benefit of the People*: if ſo be that they conduce not to theſe ends, they are utterly to be rejected, as ſinfull and obnoxious. For God never gave Magiſtrates any ſuch *power*, as to be unlimitable in

breaking

breaking his Commandements; or to become *terrible* and dreadfull to their People: but this He requires, that they especially, whom He and His People have trusted with *power* and *Magistracie*, should by their example honour God in a holy and godly *conversation*, and be *comfortable* and *profitable* to their *People*, through their *pious, peaceable*, and *Religious government*.

But how or which way doth it appear that the *unlimited Prerogative* hath, or can have respect to any such ends: nay *reason* tells us the contrary; and We have learned as much by the best of Schoolmasters, to wit, *experience*. And if the Spirit of God say true, a great deale of evill and mischief may come by it, but no good at all as ever I could read. Thus much we may perceive, if we will look into that place in the 17. *Deut.* 18. where the Spirit of God speaking concerning the King, when he shall come to sit upon the Throne of his Kingdome, *He shall write* (saith he) *a coppie of this Law in a Booke, out of that which is before the Priests the Levites, and it shall be with him; and he shall read therein all the dayes of his life, that he may learne to feare the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law, and these Statutes to do them.* Here we see the rule which God would have Kings apply themselves unto in governing of their People, but here is no grant or Charter that God at all hath given them, to rule them according to their *wills* and *pleasures*; and he binds them within the compasse of His Law. And it cannot be denied but that these Statutes and Commandements of God before spoken of, require *passive* as well as *active* Obedience. For what is here said unto Kings, is oftentimes in this Book, and else where, said unto the People; and I beleeve there is none will say, but that they are required therby to obey in both kinds: why not Kings then as well as others; for here is no exception. Nay the Spirit of God here gives us a sufficient reason, that they ought so to doe, in the words following, for so it is said, *least his heart be lifted up above his brethren.* He foresaw what mischief would come of it, if Kings should have any such Unlimited Power allowed them. And indeed how can it otherwise be, but they must needs exceedingly swell with Pride, when they shall be made like God, subject to no Laws. And what doe they else, that ascribe such a *power* unto them, as that they are no waies *accountable*, or *punishable* for any *actions* that they doe? Is not this the very next way to cause them to despise and *trample* their People under their feet, as if they were so exceedingly beneath them (though in truth they be the same, and equall with them, in respect of their *nature* and *being*, (therfore the Spirit of God here calls them their *Bretheren*) the difference only lying in their *power* and *Magistracie*) and to make them forget themselves and their humane condition, as if they were a degree above Men, by exalting them above all Laws, as if by vertue of their place and Dignitie, their very nature were changed into the Divine.

Besides this, it is further worth the marking, what other evill consequence will be readie to follow, if such a *power*, as is said before, should be ascribed. Therfore it is said in the next words (*that he turne not aside from the Commandement, to the right hand or to the left*) as who should say, to give Kings such a *power* as is Unlimited and disresponsable, it is the very next way to cause them to *presume* and take *liberty* to themselves, how they list and when they list to break the Commandements of God, and to cast his Precepts behind their backs.

Here we see now the evill that comes by this Prerogative, I would any one could shew me what that good is that doth from it arise; or where in all the Scripture it is said, *that Kings shall not be accountable for what they doe.* I perswade my selfe that it will be a taske too hard for any man to undertake.

By

F 129.207
U84

By this it appeares, what Enemies they are to the Common-wealth, and what a deale of mischief they doe, that teach such Doctrine as Kings Unlimited Power, and how abominable they must needs be both in the sight of God and Men, that teach men to erre from Gods Commandements; and to conclude all in a word, I may here say to such as our Saviour doth, *Matth.*5.19. *Whosoever shall break one of the least of these Commandements, and shall teach men so to doe, shall be call'd the least in the Kingdome of heaven.* And here also I may well remember them of the words of that prediction of the Apostle, 2 *Thess.*2.11. which are truly verified in these men. *God shall send them strong Delusions that they may beleeve a lye, that all they might be damned that beleeve not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousnesse.*

I doe not much question but that this paper may light of those that will not spare to lay Censure hard enough upon it; and it is not unlikely but it may suffer under that terrible name of Treason; yet I say it would be well for them before they shoot their bolt, to consider wisely with themselves what they doe least otherwise they prove to be such as fall foule upon the Truth of God, and so be found to be such as fight against Him, which if they doe, let themselves judge how it is like to be with them. But let it be as it will, yet the comfort is, it is not the first time that Truth hath suffer'd under as bad a Censure as this can be: and let them that are enemies to this Truth doe what they can, yet let me tell them that Truth is strong, and shall prevaile; and that howsoever it may be blamed by those that *hate* it, yet it shall never be *ashamed*. And as all Truth ought to be known, so especiallie every Truth in its chiefest time and season: for as the Wise man saith, *Pro.*25.11. *A word spoken in due season, is like apples of gold in pictures of silver*, then it is most like to do good, and then most acceptable and delightfull. I have spoken a few words upon this theame the rather, that hereby at least I might provoke those of better judgements, and are able to say farre more of this point then my selfe, according to the necessitie of the times to speak in this behalfe, if they be lovers of their King, of the Truth, and of their Countrie: And so I commend it to the blessing of GOD.

FINIS.